

## REMARKS

The office action has been carefully considered and amendments have been made to the rejected independent claims in an effort to place them in condition for allowance.

Applicants are appreciative of the allowance of claims 9-15.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the amendments that have been made in the prior response are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. It is not believed that these arguments are moot for the reason that the only difference between the current rejection and the prior rejection is that the current rejection is based on 35 U.S.C. 103 rather than 35 U.S.C. 102. The arguments that were made in the prior response state that the Ote patent does not anticipate, teach or suggest the subject matter of the claims. Therefore, it is believed that those arguments apply.

In an effort to place the independent claims in condition for immediate allowance, amendments have been made to more clearly differentiate the method as claimed in claim 1 as well as the system of claim 16 and the log manager device driver of claim 17 from the Ote patent. The method of claim 1 is now directed to a method for logging event data from at least one operable application program on a plurality of computers that comprises the steps of, *inter alia*, responding to a download request for said log manager file from any requesting one of said plurality of computers by said volume manager device driver so that said requesting computer can use said log manager file to perform diagnostic or troubleshooting activities.

The examiner states that the responding element of claim 1 is met by Ote and particularly the language from column 7, line 62, through column 8, line 7. It is submitted that this identified text does not teach or suggest the above identified step for the reason that in Ote the fault log request is sent by the manager into the agent and the agent sends the fault log back to the manager where it is displayed. Fig. 1A shows that there is only a managing computer 23 and a remote managing computer 27 as shown in Fig. 1B. This is in contrast to the method as claimed in claim 1 where there is a plurality of computers as set forth in the preamble and the responding step of the claims indicates that a requesting computer may be anyone of the plurality of computers that the plurality of computers may use the event data to perform

diagnostic or troubleshooting activities. Ote does not contemplate or suggest all of the computers having the capability of using the event data to perform diagnostic or troubleshooting activities. This is believed to be patentably different from the operation of Ote and applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this claim. Similar amendments have been made to the system claim of 16 as well as the log manager device driver claim 17. Therefore the arguments made with respect to claim 1 equally apply to these claims.

Since the rejected dependent claims necessarily include the features of the independent claims from which they depend, in addition to reciting other features not found in those claims, it is believed that the depend claims are also in condition for immediate allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

  
Roger D. Greer  
Registration No. 26,174

February 8, 2005February 7, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978